

PTO/SB/21 (08-04)

Approved for use through 07/31/2006, OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1986, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TRANSMITTAL
FORM

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

Total Number of Pages in This Submission

12

Application Number	10/680,976	RECEIVED
Filing Date	09/27/2003	CENTRAL FAX CENTER
First Named Inventor	Peter Ar-Fu Lam	
Art Unit	3714	MAY 08 2007
Examiner Name	Karkhanis, Aashish	
Attorney Docket Number	GT9	

ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form	<input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to TC
<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached	<input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Amendment/Reply	<input type="checkbox"/> Petition	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)
<input type="checkbox"/> After Final	<input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application	<input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information
<input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation	<input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter
<input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request	<input type="checkbox"/> Change of Correspondence Address	<input type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):
<input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request	<input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer	
<input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement	<input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund	
<input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____	
<input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application	<input type="checkbox"/> Landscape Table on CD	
<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53		
Remarks Important Remark (made on 05/08/2007) <i>Lam</i>		
When we filed the response fax to PTO on 04/27/2007 (pls refer to the confirmation page received as attached), we found that this transmittal form was mishandled by the fax machine. This transmittal form is now re-sent to supplement the response of 04/27/2007. We sincerely apologize for the inconvenience caused and thank you very much for the good services.		

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT

Firm Name			
Signature	<i>Lam</i>		
Printed name	Peter Ar-Fu Lam		
Date	04/27/2007	Reg. No.	

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below:

Signature *Lam*

Typed or printed name Peter Ar-Fu Lam Date 04/27/2007

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.6. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

USPTO

4/27/2007 11:58:22 AM PAGE 1/001 Fax Server

TO:Auto-reply fax to 310 320 9812 COMPANY:



Auto-Reply Facsimile Transmission

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
MAY 08 2007

TO: Fax Sender at 310 320 9812

Fax Information
Date Received:
Total Pages:

4/27/2007 11:52:31 AM [Eastern Daylight Time]
11 (including cover page)

ADVISORY: This is an automatically generated return receipt confirmation of the facsimile transmission received by the Office. Please check to make sure that the number of pages listed as received in Total Pages above matches what was intended to be sent. Applicants are advised to retain this receipt in the unlikely event that proof of this facsimile transmission is necessary. Applicants are also advised to use the certificate of facsimile transmission procedures set forth in 37 CFR 1.8(a) and (b), 37 CFR 1.6(f). Trademark Applicants, also see the Trademark Manual of Examining Procedure (TMEP) section 306 et seq.

Received
Cover
Page

<=====>

APR-27-2007 00:52 AM		310 320 9812	P-01																		
<u>IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE</u>																					
<table border="0"> <tr> <td>In Re Application of:</td> <td>Examiner:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PETER AR-FU LAM</td> <td>Karshana, Assthan</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Serial No. 10/880,887</td> <td>Group: 3714</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Alleg. 08/12/2003</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>For: Electronics Toy Play Set</td> <td>Docket: OTG</td> </tr> <tr> <td> </td> <td>April 27, 2007</td> </tr> <tr> <td> </td> <td> </td> </tr> <tr> <td> </td> <td> </td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"> <p>Corresponds to the office action dated February 24, 2004, please amend claims 36 to 39 as shown in attachment A. After the amendment, the applicant elected claims 1-35, 36, 37 and 39 for examination. After a thorough evaluation of claims 36, 37 and 39, it was found that the step (d) of claim 39 was provided as an amendment of claim 36 only and adds no value to claims 36, 37 and 39. Accordingly the business related characteristics of claims 36, 37 and 38 are eliminated to overcome the requirement of restriction.</p> <p>After the current amendment, claim 36 still falls into the reason of restriction outlined in the office action dated 08/30/2007. However the applicant has a different opinion that the two classes (represented by claims 36 and 39) are not two distinct subcombinations. The applicant viewed the relationship of claims 36 and 39 to be combination-specific and subcombination-specific as discussed in MPEP 806.06. This is because the subcombination of claim 36 has specific utility and that the combination of claim 39 is specific and depends on the specific characteristics of claim 39. This relationship is clearly represented by the block diagram shown as follow.</p> </td> </tr> </table>				In Re Application of:	Examiner:	PETER AR-FU LAM	Karshana, Assthan	Serial No. 10/880,887	Group: 3714	Alleg. 08/12/2003		For: Electronics Toy Play Set	Docket: OTG		April 27, 2007					<p>Corresponds to the office action dated February 24, 2004, please amend claims 36 to 39 as shown in attachment A. After the amendment, the applicant elected claims 1-35, 36, 37 and 39 for examination. After a thorough evaluation of claims 36, 37 and 39, it was found that the step (d) of claim 39 was provided as an amendment of claim 36 only and adds no value to claims 36, 37 and 39. Accordingly the business related characteristics of claims 36, 37 and 38 are eliminated to overcome the requirement of restriction.</p> <p>After the current amendment, claim 36 still falls into the reason of restriction outlined in the office action dated 08/30/2007. However the applicant has a different opinion that the two classes (represented by claims 36 and 39) are not two distinct subcombinations. The applicant viewed the relationship of claims 36 and 39 to be combination-specific and subcombination-specific as discussed in MPEP 806.06. This is because the subcombination of claim 36 has specific utility and that the combination of claim 39 is specific and depends on the specific characteristics of claim 39. This relationship is clearly represented by the block diagram shown as follow.</p>	
In Re Application of:	Examiner:																				
PETER AR-FU LAM	Karshana, Assthan																				
Serial No. 10/880,887	Group: 3714																				
Alleg. 08/12/2003																					
For: Electronics Toy Play Set	Docket: OTG																				
	April 27, 2007																				
<p>Corresponds to the office action dated February 24, 2004, please amend claims 36 to 39 as shown in attachment A. After the amendment, the applicant elected claims 1-35, 36, 37 and 39 for examination. After a thorough evaluation of claims 36, 37 and 39, it was found that the step (d) of claim 39 was provided as an amendment of claim 36 only and adds no value to claims 36, 37 and 39. Accordingly the business related characteristics of claims 36, 37 and 38 are eliminated to overcome the requirement of restriction.</p> <p>After the current amendment, claim 36 still falls into the reason of restriction outlined in the office action dated 08/30/2007. However the applicant has a different opinion that the two classes (represented by claims 36 and 39) are not two distinct subcombinations. The applicant viewed the relationship of claims 36 and 39 to be combination-specific and subcombination-specific as discussed in MPEP 806.06. This is because the subcombination of claim 36 has specific utility and that the combination of claim 39 is specific and depends on the specific characteristics of claim 39. This relationship is clearly represented by the block diagram shown as follow.</p>																					

Page 1 of 11

PAGE 1/11 RCVD AT 4/27/2007 11:52:31 AM [Eastern Daylight Time] SVR:USPTO-EXRF-6/17 DNIS:2738300 CSID:310 320 9812 DURATION (mm:ss):01-18